

**REMARKS**

Applicant recognizes with appreciation that Examiner has indicated that Claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In this Amendment, Applicant has cancelled Claims 4 and 11 – 20, without prejudice or disclaimer and amended Claims 1 and 5. Claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable features of Claim 4. Claim 5 has been amended to correct certain informality. The support for the amendment can be found throughout the specification. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been introduced by the amended claims. All claims are now present for examination and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the preceding amendments and the following comments.

**OBJECTION TO CLAIMS:**

Claims 5 and 15 have been objected as containing informalities.

It is respectfully submitted that the currently amended claims have corrected the informalities pointed out by the Examiner. More specifically, Claim 15 has been cancelled. The objection to Claim 15 is moot. In addition, the term “the BIOS in work” has been changed to “the BIOS”, which has antecedent basis in Claim 1.

Therefore, the objection to the claims has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the description is requested.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:**

Claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Landry et al (US 6,732,301), hereinafter Landry, in view of Gharda et al. (US 6,560,702), hereinafter Gharda.

Applicant traverses the rejection and respectfully submits that the embodiments of present-claimed invention are not obvious over Landry in view of Gharda. At first Claim 11 – 20 have been cancelled. The rejection to these claims is moot. In addition, Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate allowable features in Claim 4. Therefore, Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2 – 3 and 5 – 10 are also allowable by their dependency on Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art will not have motivation and/or expectation of success to combine Landry with Gharda to achieve the present invention. Even if they are combined, it does not render the embodiments of the present invention obvious.


Therefore, the newly presented claims are not obvious over Landry in view of Gharda and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

Having overcome all outstanding grounds of rejection, the application is now in condition for allowance, and prompt action toward that end is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

Date: March 10, 2005  
(202) 638-6666  
400 Seventh Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Atty. Dkt. No.: P67611US0

By   
John C. Holman  
Registration No. 22,769